

C I R C U L A T I O N C O P Y F O R S I G N A T U R E S

9 April 1975

MEMORANDUM FOR: CIA Component Administration Offices in Key Building, Rosslyn
FROM : Agency Employees Using Key Building Parking Facilities
SUBJECT : Petition Seeking Relief from Key Bldg Parking Fee Increase(s)

The undersigned hereby protest the announced 20% increase (to \$360 per year) in the Key Building parking fee, due to become effective 1 May 75, as both discriminatory and unjustified for the following reasons:

(1) We have been and continue to be discriminated against as compared with Agency employees working at Langley Headquarters, who are provided free parking and therefore already end each year with \$300 more usable income (at the same Grade/Step levels) than do we who must pay for our own parking in Key Bldg! And those among us who decline to pay so much must still run an added risk of unprotected parking on local area sidestreets.

(2) We have been observing for some time now the dwindling use of Key Bldg parking spaces and strongly suspect that we are now being asked to make up that difference in reduced income for Charles E. Smith Companies (CESC), formerly known as Charles E. Smith Management.

(3) Since there are no apparent special garage services or attendants, or other building maintenance personnel solely responsible for supervision of the parking garage, we must assume that the parking fee increase comes as a result of some increase in the management's operating expenses for the building as a whole. Therefore, we feel that the lessee (U.S.Gov't), rather than a couple hundred Agency employees using the parking garage, should be the major contributor toward any such increased building operating expenses if, as we suspect, this constitutes a major excuse for the proposed increase in the parking fee.

(4) Lacking specific knowledge of the privileges, restrictions, and monetary terms of the Gov't lease contract with CESC (CESM), we tend to view this situation as one in which the Agency (as fee collecting intermediary) is actually condoning, if not in fact encouraging, CESC (CESM) to oblige Agency employees -- the majority occupants of the bldg -- to subsidize and/or supplement the Agency's (Gov't) rental outlay for Key Bldg. Since we also lack any knowledge of the terms of such contracts between CESC (CESM) and other corporate occupants of Key Bldg, neither do we have any basis for concrete comparison of our situation vis-a-vis theirs.

In view of the above and of the new Freedom of Information Act, we feel entitled to (but are not yet asking for) a FULL disclosure of such terms of the Government's lease with CESC (CESM) as: what it costs, what it entitles the Agency to, when and under what negotiating conditions it is renewable, and how it compares with leases held by other corporate occupants of Key Bldg.

We therefore seek through the Agency -- as primarily responsible for our being thus obliged to divert so much of our salaries in the first place, and as fee-collecting intermediary in the second place -- some form of relief from the prospect of this and further such penalties at the hands of CESC (or CESM), and we believe that, if nothing more, we are at least entitled to a FULL account of whatever justification may be claimed for such parking fee

Next 1 Page(s) In Document Exempt